

REMARKS

Applicant requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-36 are pending in this application, with Claims 1, 9, 15 and 26 being independent.

Claims 1, 9, 15 and 26 have been amended. Applicant submits that support for the amendments can be found in the original disclosure at least, for example, in Figs. 5 and 6 and the corresponding description. Therefore, Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

Claims 1-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,170,466 to Rogan et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,427,032 to Irons et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

As recited in independent Claim 1, the present invention includes, *inter alia*, the features of determining based on a predetermined reference whether each digital document is to be stored in a compressed or non-compressed state, and generating an archive file that stores *both* a compressed first digital document and a non-compressed second digital document. Independent Claim 9 is an apparatus claim including features similar to those of Claim 1. Applicant submits that the cited art, whether considered individually or in combination, fails to disclose or suggest at least the aforementioned features.

Rogan et al. appears to disclose that a packet includes compressed image data. However, that patent is silent with respect to determining whether each digital document is to be stored in a compressed or non-compressed state, as well as being silent with respect to an archive file that stores both a compressed first digital document and a non-compressed second digital document.

Irons et al. likewise fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features.

That patent merely discloses digital filing using an identification of a label, but does not disclose or suggest determining whether each document is to be stored in a compressed or non-compressed state, and does not disclose or suggest generating an archive file that stores both a compressed first digital document and a non-compressed second digital document. The Examiner cites col. 7, lines 47-51 of Irons et al. in the Office Action. However, Applicant submits that the cited portion of that patent refers to folding out baskets 203 that are a type of physical desktop storage and are not pertinent to the claimed features.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that independent Claims 1 and 9 are patentable over the cited art.

Independent Claims 15 and 26 recite, *inter alia*, the features of determining based on a predetermined condition whether each digital document is to be uploaded to a server and generating an archive file which stores *both* abstract data of a digital document determined to be uploaded and a digital document which is determined not to be uploaded, without storing the main body of the digital document determined to be uploaded. Applicant submits that the cited art does not disclose or suggest at least these features and that Claims 15 and 26 are also patentable over the cited art.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as for the additional features they recite.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'B. L. Klock', is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant

Brian L. Klock

Registration No. 36,570

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO

30 Rockefeller Plaza

New York, New York 10112-3801

Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

BLK/lew

FCHS_WS 1891705_1.DOC